

REMARKS

The Final Office Action, mailed October 16, 2007, considered claims 1–11, 13–15, 23–25 and 27–34. Claims 1–11, 12–15, 17–25, and 27–34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1–29, 32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Berman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,710,832 (filed Dec. 8, 1995) (hereinafter Berman). Claims 30–31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berman, in view of Loudon et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0190074 (filed Apr. 17, 2003) (hereinafter Loudon).¹

By this response, claims 1 and 23 are amended and claim 14 is cancelled. Claims 1–11, 13, 15, 17–25 and 27–34 remain pending. Claims 1, 22, 23, and 34 are independent claims which remain at issue. Support for the amendments may be found within Specification pp. 14, 17, 29, and Fig. 4.²

As reflected in the claims, the present invention is directed generally toward embodiments for personalization and training of handwriting recognition. Claim 1 recites, for instance, in combination with all the elements of the claim, a system for personalizing handwriting recognition. The system includes an ink service engine which receives ink handwritten by a user and stores the ink in an ink database. The system also includes a harvesting service engine which collects text authored by the user and stores the collected text in a harvesting service database, the harvesting service database comprising a text database, a non-text database, and a document database. The system also includes a trained data engine for storing trained data in a trained data database and a component having interfaces for personalizing a handwriting recognizer with data authored by the user. Further, the system includes a trainer coupled to the component for training the handwriting recognizer with the data authored by the user and the collected ink.

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² However, it should be noted that the present invention and claims as recited take support from the entire Specification. As such, no particular part of the Specification should be considered separately from the entirety of the Specification.

Claim 22 recites a computer program product embodiment comprising the system of claim 1.

Claim 23 recites, in combination with all the elements of the claim, a method for personalizing handwriting recognition. The method includes collecting data authored by a user, including text authored by the user and context information, for personalizing handwriting recognition. The method also includes storing the collected data in a database which includes a text database, a non-text database, and a document database. The method also includes collecting ink handwritten by the user and storing the collected ink in an ink database. Further, the method includes training a handwriting recognizer using the stored data and collected ink and storing in a trained data database, trained data which is the result of training and which is used by the handwriting recognizer.

Claim 34 is a computer program product embodiment of the method of claim 23.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1 and 23 (and their dependent claims) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out the subject matter regarded as the invention.³ Amendments to both claims 1 and 23 have now cured the problems associated with "a trainer" in claim 1 and "the recognizer" in claim 9. Favorable reconsideration under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested for the now-amended claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Independent claims 1, 22, 23, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berman.⁴ The claims have been amended by this response and the Applicants submit that Berman fails to teach each and every element of the independent claims as they are now recited.

In particular, in reference to claim 1, Berman fails to teach an ink service engine which receives ink handwritten by a user and stores the ink in an ink database. Berman also fails to teach a harvesting service engine which collects text authored by the user and stores the collected text in a harvesting service database, the harvesting service database comprising a text database,

³ Office Communication p. 2 (paper no. 100607, mailed Oct. 16, 2007).

⁴ Office Comm. pp. 2-3.

a non-text database, and a document database. Further, Berman fails to teach a trained data engine for storing trained data in a trained data database.

Because Berman fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as now recited, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) would be improper and should be withdrawn. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of claim 1. As claim 22 is a computer program product embodiment of the system of claim 1, favorable reconsideration of claim 22 is also respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 23, Berman fails to teach collecting data authored by a user for personalizing handwriting recognition, the data comprising text authored by the user and context information. Berman also fails to teach storing the collected data in a database, the database comprising a text database, a non-text database, and a document database. Berman also fails to teach collecting ink handwritten by the user and storing the collected ink in an ink database. Further, Berman also fails to teach storing trained data in a trained data database, the trained data being the results of training and the trained data being used by the handwriting recognizer.

Because Berman fails to teach each and every element of claim 23 as now recited, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) would be improper and should be withdrawn. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of claim 23. As claim 34 is a computer program product embodiment of the method of claim 23, favorable reconsideration of claim 34 is also respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and the foregoing discussion, the independent claims should now be in condition for allowance and the Applicants respectfully submit that the other rejections to the remaining dependent claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings

officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 16th day of January, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. D. Nydegger', written in a cursive style.

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973
801.533.9800

RDN/JCJ/TMB:kjb
KJB0000012099V001.DOC